REMARKS

By this amendment, new claims 17-19 have been added. Claims 14-16 were previously

canceled. Accordingly, claims 1-13 and 17-19 are currently pending in the application, of which

claims 1, 8, 17 and 19 are independent claims.

Applicant respectfully submits that the above amendments do not add new matter to the

application and are fully supported by the specification. Support for the newly added claims

may be found at least in Figures 8-12 and page 9, line 9 through page 12, line 20 of the

specification.

In view of the above amendments and the following Remarks, Applicant respectfully

requests reconsideration and timely withdrawal of the pending rejections for the reasons

discussed below.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 2, and 6-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly

unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,373,195 issued to Whang, et al. ("Whang") in view of U.S.

Patent No. 5,990,630 issued to Nakamura ("Nakamura") in further view of U.S. Patent No.

6,043,604 issued to Horiuchi et al. ("Horiuchi"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for

at least the following reasons.

To establish a prima facie case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First,

there must be some suggestion or motivation to modify the reference or to combine reference

teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Third, the reference or

references, when combined, must disclose or suggest all of the claim limitations. The

motivation to modify the prior art and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found

--8--

in the prior art and not based upon a patent applicant's disclosure. See in re Vaeck, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

Applicant respectfully submits that the examiner has failed to establish a prima facie case of obviousness at least because there is no suggestion or motivation to combine the reference teachings.

In order to reject independent claims 1 and 8, the examiner combines the three references of Whang, Nakamura, and Horiuchi. However, just because references may be combined does not mean that a motivation to combine the references exists, MPEP § 2143.01.III. In this case, the examiner's combination of Whang, Nakamura, and Horiuchi appears to result from impermissible hindsight. Whang teaches "an AC plasma display panel for achieving improved absolute luminance and luminous efficiency at the same time..." (Abstract). In this case, adding Nakamura's dielectric and protective layers to Whang's AC PDP, as the Office Action suggests, may adversely affect Whang's improved absolute luminance and luminous efficiency. Hence, since Whang already achieves improved absolute luminance and luminous efficiency, there is no motivation to add dielectric and protective layers. which increase a plasma display panel's manufacturing time and cost. Furthermore, a person of ordinary skill in the art, confronted with the problem of improving contrast in a plasma display panel having a closed barrier rib structure (specification, page 3, lines 9-10), would not be motivated to look to Horiuchi in order to solve this problem since Horiuchi relates to a plasma display panel with stripe-type barrier ribs. Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that there is no suggestion or motivation to combine the teachings of Whang, Nakamura, and Horiuchi in the manner that the Office Action proposes.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 1 and 8. Claims 2 and 6-11 depend from claim 1 or claim 8 and are allowable at least for this reason. Since none of the other prior art of record, whether taken

alone or in any combination, discloses or suggests all the features of the claimed invention,

Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1 and 8, and all the claims that depend

therefrom, are allowable.

Claims 3-5 and 12-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly

unpatentable over Whang, Nakamura, and Horiuchi in further view of Japanese Publication No.

2001-118512 of Nishimura et al. ("Nishimura"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for

at least the following reasons.

Claims 3-5 and 12-13 depend from claim 1 or claim 8 and are allowable at least for this

reason. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

rejection of claims 3-5 and 12-13.

Added Claims

Added claims 17-19 are directed to additional features of the invention, which are not

disclosed or suggested in the art of record. Specifically, Applicant respectfully submits that

claims 17 and 19 are patentable because the prior art of record fails to teach or suggest at least

"wherein the first barrier rib members and the second barrier rib members have different heights

from each other, and the higher barrier rib members of the first barrier rib members and the

second barrier rib members comprise a layered structure comprising a white colored layer and

an opaque colored layer, and the lower barrier rib members of the first barrier rib members and

the second barrier rib members comprise the same colored layer as a layer of the higher barrier

rib members that is closer to the first substrate."

--10--

Application No.: 10/607,152 Reply dated September 29, 2006 Response to Office Action of June 30, 2006

CONCLUSION

Applicant believes that a full and complete response has been made to the pending

Office Action and respectfully submits that all of the stated objections and grounds for rejection have been overcome or rendered moot. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that all

pending claims are allowable and that the application is in condition for allowance.

Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of

this response, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's undersigned representative at

the number below to expedite prosecution.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted.

/hae-chan park/

Hae-Chan Park Reg. No. 50,114

Date: September 29, 2006

H.C. Park & Associates, PLC 8500 Leesburg Pike Suite 7500

Vienna, VA 22182 Tel: 703-288-5105 Fax: 703-288-5139

HCP/RTS/tmk

--11--